

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/942,624		DARBY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	DONNIE L. CROSLAND		2636	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DONNIE L. CROSLAND (Examiner). (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Patric McPherson(46255)(Attorney). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 June 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 22-50 and 52-57.

Identification of prior art discussed: Stevens et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
 DONNIE L. CROSLAND  
 PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. McPherson pointed out that the prior art fails to provide any teachings of the relative position of the railcar as a function of the time between the receipt of the pneumatic pulse and the receipt of the immediately prededing RF message transmitted by another railcar. No agreement was made. Attorney points out in arguments the specifics of the above argued limitation. It appears from a review of Stevens that only the Heu transmits the rf signal for serialization instead of the claimed imeadiately preceding unittransmitting the rf signal for serialization..